

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-5 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Telephone Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone interview conducted on October 11, 2007, with Examiner Deschere and Supervisory Examiner Deberadinis. At that interview, a simple change to the claims were suggested in relation to the prior art. It was agreed that an Amendment should be filed along with a Request for Continued Examination so that the changes could be considered in full. By way of the present Amendment, Applicants are presenting an Amendment which include two changes to claim 1 and the addition of two dependent claims containing additional limitations. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for reconsideration.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Tsujikado (U.S. Patent 6,597,074) in view of Massie (U.S. Patent 6,144,115). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Tsujikado shows a power source control system having a plurality of power supplies 32 and 36. The power actuation unit 44 outputs a signal to activate the power output. The Examiner admits that this reference does not teach the plurality of second actuation signals nor a plurality of second confirmation signals. The Examiner relies on Massie

to show a power sharing distribution system with three connected power supplies with a plurality of actuation signals and a plurality of confirmation signals.

Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is not obvious over these two references. First, it is noted that Tsujikado et al. is designed as a back-up power source including an AC source and a backup battery. The Massie et al. system, the power supplies which do not act simultaneously, but rather mutually exclusive times. Claim 1 has now been amended to make it clear that the plurality of second power actuation signals are simultaneously output. This is not possible for either of the references. In the primary reference, the battery backup is used only when the AC system is down. In the Massie system, the three different power supplies operate in phases so they are not simultaneously actuated. Further, claim 1 further describes the power supplies as "which transform electric power". Thus, this is not the same as a battery which is a power source but does not hence form the power. Further, in Massie et al. it appears that the power supplies uploads at different times but are not described as transforming the power. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is further allowable over these two references.

Furthermore, it is pointed out that claim 1 previously also included the limitation that the second power confirmation signal was output to a linked load. Applicants submit that this is also not seen in the references. The final phrase of claim 1 further indicates that the electric power matches the corresponding load which is also not seen in the reference. Based on these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is clearly allowable.

Claims 2-5 dependent from claim 1 and as such are that you also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable. Thus, claim 3 describes the control unit as having a number of output legs

corresponding to the number of parallel power supplies. Claim 4 describes the output of the control unit as having a number of second power actuation signals to expand the number of power units. Claim 5 describes the control unit as shutting down the power supplies in case of the damaged power supply. Applicants submit that these features are also not seen in the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now allowable.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the Patent relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

ROBERT F. GNUSE
Registration # 27,295